

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the outstanding Official Action mailed December 10, 2004, the shortened statutory period for filing a response having expired on March 10, 2005. In this regard, Applicant's submit herewith a one-month extension petition to reset the deadline for responding to the Official Action to an including April 10, 2005. Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant in its communication of August 20, 2004 presented arguments to traverse the Examiner's restriction requirement. In considering the restriction proper, the Examiner asserts in the current Official Action that the claims, at least as to claims 7, 16 and 28, are not clearly limiting of the mounting method to a plurality of supporting surfaces. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify this feature of the claimed invention.

For example, independent claims 7 and 16 recite that the method is directed to assembling a bracket from a plurality of components for mounting a device "to a plurality of supports." As further amended, the brackets comprise "a mount selected from the group consisting of a clamp mount, a wall mount and a flat mount for attachment to one of a plurality of supports." Claims 28, 29, 31 and 32 are similarly limited to a plurality of supports. Thus, the claims of the present invention are all directed to a single inventive concept. That is, a method of assembling a bracket from a plurality of components for mounting of the device to one of the plurality of supports, e.g., supporting surfaces, each of a different configuration.

These amendments overcome the basis for the Examiner's restriction requirement as set forth in the Official Action of

July 27, 2004. In this regard, the restriction requirement was based upon the distinction between a plurality of supporting surfaces and a single support. As all claims are now directed to the single inventive concept, all claims should be maintained within the present application. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner has relied upon *Kump et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,289,618 either alone or in combination with *Hung*, United States Patent No. 5,938,159 in rejecting Applicant's claims. *Kump et al.* discloses multiple embodiments of a display system adapted for attachment to either a horizontal shelf or a vertical supporting surface. Although *Kump et al.* refers to the display system as an interchangeable display system, the only aspect of interchangeability is the ability of the sign holder to be adaptable for attachment to different brackets. There is no disclosure in *Kump et al.* of the different bracket configurations themselves being assembled from a kit of components for different surface configurations like the present invention.

In *Kump et al.*, the sign holder, e.g., element B in Fig. 1 arguably corresponds to Applicant's device or computer display screen which is mounted to one of a plurality of supports, e.g., supporting surfaces, via the various bracket configurations. As disclosed, the bracket for mounting the sign holder to a horizontal shelf either comprises the Bracket A shown in Fig. 1 or the Bracket C in shown Fig. 3. Both of these brackets are of different construction. Specifically, Bracket A is provided with feet 14 and hooks 16, while Bracket C is devoid of feet and hooks. These two Brackets A and C are not suitable for mounting to a vertical surface, hence the Bracket H shown in Fig 16 or the Bracket J shown in Fig. 19.

Each of these brackets are a fully assembled bracket dedicated for the particular construction of the horizontal

shelf or vertical supporting surface to which these brackets are to be attached. These brackets are not provided in the nature of a kit which includes a plurality of components which are to be assembled into different bracket configurations such as a clamp mount, a flat mount, or a wall mount as claimed by Applicant. Rather, *Kump et al.* merely provides individual fully assembled brackets each dedicated for a particular mounting surface. The sign holder of *Kump et al.* is not relevant, as the sign holder does not form any part of the bracket configuration which is used to mount the bracket to the supporting surface. Accordingly, *Kump et al.* merely selects the desired bracket from a plurality of brackets, dependent on the nature of the supporting surface. *Kump et al.* is therefore irrelevant to Applicant's claimed invention and should be withdrawn as a reference.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure in *Kump et al.* of any mounting bracket functioning for attachment of same to the edge portion of the support as claimed by Applicant in each of the independent claims. To this end, the Examiner refers to Fig. 3 of *Hung* as disclosing a bracket adapted for an edge mount. In order to meet the requirement of a showing or a suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner states that it would be obvious to utilize the features of *Hung* in the method of *Kump et al.* so as to "adjust the position of engaged locating seat at the desired location and angle." This position by the Examiner is not understood, and in any event, does not support any suggestion for combination of the references.

As previously noted, *Kump et al.* only is concerned with attaching a sign holder to either a horizontal shelf or a vertical supporting surface. These are accomplished by the very specific bracket embodiments disclosed in *Kump et al.* and as noted by Applicant hereinabove. There is no suggestion in *Kump et al.* of any need to provide an edge mount arrangement. Rather,

Kump et al. actually teaches away from any such suggestion as the bracket configurations are adequate for mounting the sign holder via connection of the bracket to either the horizontal surface of a shelf or the vertical surface of an upright. Thus, the Examiner's suggestion for combination has no merit.

Furthermore, the construction of the clamp mount disclosed in *Hung* is entirely contrary to any bracket configuration disclosed in *Kump et al.* Applicant is at a loss as to how these brackets could be integrated in any meaningful way. For the aforementioned reasons, the Examiner's rejection of obviousness over the combination of *Kump et al.* and *Hung* is traverse and should therefore be withdrawn. Similarly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 30 over *Hung* in view of *Kump et al.* is also traversed.

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT THE EXAMINER ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT AND CONSIDERATION OF APPLICANT'S INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FILED ON APRIL 22, 2004. APPLICANT SUBMITS HERewith A COURTESY COPY OF THE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AS PREVIOUSLY FILED IN THIS APPLICATION.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 09/916,934

Docket No.: INNOFF 3.0-006 DIV

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested Amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen B. Goldman

Registration No.: 28,512

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

554111_1.DOC